



PATENT
1982-0149P

IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant: Hiroshi OGAWA Conf.: 5103
Appl. No.: 09/560,819 Group: 2879
Filed: April 28, 2000 Examiner: Sikha Roy
For: RADIATION IMAGE CONVERSION PANEL

**REQUEST FOR NEW OFFICE ACTION AND FOR
REPLY PERIOD TO BE RESET OR RESTARTED
PURSUANT TO M.P.E.P. § 710.06**

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

June 4, 2004

Sir:

Applicants request that that the Reply Period to be reset or restarted because the current Office Action, dated May 18, 2004, is defective, and/or Applicants' reply dated March 5, 2004, has not been considered.

A brief summary of the prosecution history for the above-identified application is as follows. A Reply After Final Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 was filed by Applicants on January 21, 2004, which was in response to the Final Office Action dated October 21, 2003. An Advisory Action issued on February 25, 2004, which was subsequent to the January 21, 2004, response, that indicated that Applicants' January 21, 2004, Reply would not be entered. Thereafter, on March 5, 2004, Applicants filed a Request for Continued Examination ("RCE") pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.114, and requested entry of the January 21, 2004, Reply. Applicants also

8
J
Appl. No. 09/560,819

Art Unit 2879

June 4, 2004

**Request For New Office Action and Reply Period to be Reset or Restarted
Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 710.06**

filed a Preliminary Reply under 37 C.F.R. § 1.111 with the RCE on March 5, 2004. The Preliminary Reply, among other things, added new claim 15 for the Examiner's consideration. The current Office Action of May 18, 2004, subsequently issued.

The current Office Action of May 18, 2004, is defective because the Office Action does not consider Applicants' Preliminary Reply of March 5, 2004, which was timely filed before issuance of the May 18, 2004, Office Action. The May 18 Office Action does consider Applicants' reply of January 21, 2004.

Thus, pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 710.06, Applicants herein request a new Office Action with the appropriate restarting or resetting of the set period for reply. Applicants initially reserved their right for this request when Applicants' representative left voicemail messages with Examiners Sikha Roy and Nimeshkumar D. Patel on June 3, 2004. The mentioned voicemail messages included a request for a new Office Action, an explanation of the reasons for the defect in the current Office Action, the need to have the March 5 Preliminary Reply considered, and a request to reset or restart the period for reply.

Thus, Applicants have called to the attention of the USPTO within one (1) month of the mailing date of the current Office Action of this defect, request for a new Office Action, consideration of the March 5, 2004, Preliminary Reply, and request to reset or restart the period for Applicants' reply.

Appl. No. 09/560,819

Art Unit 2879

June 4, 2004


**Request For New Office Action and Reply Period to be Reset or Restarted
Pursuant to M.P.E.P. § 710.06**

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Eugene T. Perez (Reg. No. 48,501) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Marc S. Weiner, #32,181

MSW/ETP
1982-0149P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000